arXiv:1612.06032v1 [math.GN] 19 Dec 2016

Sobriety of quantale-valued cotopological spaces*

Dexue Zhang
School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China
dxzhang@scu.edu.cn

Abstract

For each commutative and integral quantale, making use of the fuzzy order between closed sets, a theory of sobriety for quantale-valued cotopological spaces is established based on irreducible closed sets.

Keywords Fuzzy topology, quantale, quantale-valued order, quantale-valued cotopological space, sobriety, irreducible closed set

1 Introduction

A topological space X is sober if each of its irreducible closed subsets is the closure of exactly one point in X. Sobriety of topological spaces can be described via the well-known adjunction

$$\mathcal{O} \dashv \mathrm{pt}$$

between the category Top of topological spaces and the opposite of the category Frm of frames [9]. Precisely, X is sober if $\eta_X \colon X \longrightarrow \mathrm{pt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$ is a bijection (hence a homeomorphism), where η denotes the unit of the adjunction $\mathcal{O} \dashv \mathrm{pt}$.

In the classical setting, a topological space can be described in terms of open sets as well as closed sets, and we can switch between open sets and closed sets by taking complements. So, it makes no difference whether we choose to work with closed sets or with open sets. In the fuzzy setting, since the table of truth-values is usually a quantale, not a Boolean algebra, there is no natural way to switch between open sets and closed sets. So, it may make a difference whether we postulate topological spaces in terms of open sets or in terms of closed sets. For instance, an essential difference between the behaviors of quantale-valued topological space and quantale-valued cotopological spaces is exhibited in [3, 4].

The frame approach to sobriety of topological spaces makes use of open sets; while the irreducible-closed-set approach makes use of closed sets. Extending the theory of sober spaces to the fuzzy setting is an interesting topic in fuzzy topology. Most of the existing works focus on the frame approach, that is, to find a fuzzy counterpart of the category Frm of frames, then establish an adjunction between the category of fuzzy topological spaces and that of *fuzzy frames*. Works in this regard include Rodabaugh [25], Zhang and Liu [32], Kotzé [12, 13], Srivastava and Khastgir [27], Pultr and Rodabaugh [20, 21, 22, 23], Gutiérrez García, Höhle and de Prada Vicente [6], and Yao [29, 30], etc. But, the irreducible-closed-set approach to sobriety of fuzzy topological spaces is seldom touched, except in Kotzé [12, 13].

In this paper, making use of the fuzzy inclusion order between closed sets, we establish a theory of sobriety for quantale-valued topological spaces based on irreducible closed sets. Actually, this theory is concerned with sobriety of *quantale-valued cotopological spaces*. By a quantale-valued cotopological space we mean a "fuzzy topological space" postulated in terms of closed sets. The term *quantale-valued topological space* is reserved for "fuzzy topological space" postulated in terms of open sets.

*This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11371265).

In most works on fuzzy frames, the table of truth-values is assumed to be a frame, even a completely distributive lattice sometimes. But, in this paper, the table of truth-values, i.e., the quantale $\mathcal{Q}$, is only assumed to be a commutative and integral quantale. BL-algebras and left continuous t-norms, which play a crucial role in fuzzy logic [7, 11], are important examples of such quantales.

The contents are arranged as follows. Section 2 recall basic ideas about quantale-valued ordered sets and quantale-valued $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces. Section 3, making use of the quantale-valued order between closed sets in a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space, establishes a theory of sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces based on irreducible closed sets. In particular, the sobrification of a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space is constructed. The last section, Section 4, presents some interesting examples in the case that $\mathcal{Q}$ is the unit interval $[0, 1]$ coupled with a (left) continuous t-norm.

2 Quantale-valued ordered sets and quantale-valued cotopological spaces

In this paper, $\mathcal{Q} = (Q, \&)$ always denotes a commutative and integral quantale, unless otherwise specified. Precisely, Q is a complete lattice with a bottom element 0 and a top element 1, $\&$ is a binary operation on Q such that $(Q, \&, 1)$ is a commutative monoid and $p\& \bigvee_{j\in J} q_j = \bigvee_{j\in J} p\&q_j$ for all $p \in Q$ and $\{q_j\}_{j\in J} \subseteq Q$.

Since the semigroup operation $\&$ distributes over arbitrary joins, it determines a binary operation $\to$ on Q via the adjoint property

$$p\&q \le r \iff q \le p \to r.$$

The binary operation $\to$ is called the *implication*, or the *residuation*, corresponding to $\&$.

Some basic properties of the binary operations $\&$ and $\to$ are collected below, they can be found in many places, e.g. [2, 26].

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quantale. Then*

(1) $1 \to p = p$.

(2) $p \le q \iff 1 = p \to q$.

(3) $p \to (q \to r) = (p\&q) \to r$.

(4) $p\&(p \to q) \le q$.

(5) $\left(\bigvee_{j\in J} p_j\right) \to q = \bigwedge_{j\in J}(p_j \to q)$.

(6) $p \to \left(\bigwedge_{j\in J} q_j\right) = \bigwedge_{j\in J}(p \to q_j)$.

We often write $\neg p$ for $p \to 0$ and call it the *negation* of p. Though it is true that $p \le \neg\neg p$ for all $p \in Q$, the inequality $\neg\neg p \le p$ does not always hold.

A quantale $\mathcal{Q}$ is said to satisfy the *law of double negation* if

$$(p \to 0) \to 0 = p,$$

i.e., $\neg\neg p = p$, for all $p \in Q$.

Proposition 2.2. *[2] Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}$ is a quantale that satisfies the law of double negation. Then*

(1) $p \to q = \neg(p\&\neg q) = \neg q \to \neg p$.

(2) $p\&q = \neg(q \to \neg p) = \neg(p \to \neg q)$.

(3) $\neg(\bigwedge_{i\in I} p_i) = \bigvee_{i\in I} \neg p_i$.

In the class of quantales, the quantales with the unit interval $[0,1]$ as underlying lattice are of particular interest in fuzzy set theory [7, 11]. In this case, the semigroup operation $\&$ is called a left continuous t-norm on $[0,1]$ [11]. If a left continuous t-norm $\&$ on $[0,1]$ is a continuous function with respect to the usual topology, then it is called a continuous t-norm.

Example 2.3. ([11]) Some basic t-norms:

(1) The minimum t-norm: $a\&b = a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. The corresponding implication is given by

$$a \to b = \begin{cases} 1, & a \leq b; \\ b, & a > b. \end{cases}$$

(2) The product t-norm: $a\&b = a \cdot b$. The corresponding implication is given by

$$a \to b = \begin{cases} 1, & a \leq b; \\ b/a, & a > b. \end{cases}$$

(3) The Łukasiewicz t-norm: $a\&b = \max\{a + b - 1, 0\}$. The corresponding implication is given by

$$a \to b = \min\{1, 1 - a + b\}.$$

In this case, $([0,1], \&)$ satisfies the law of double negation.

(4) The nilpotent minimum t-norm:

$$a\&b = \begin{cases} 0, & a + b \leq 1; \\ \min\{a, b\}, & a + b > 1. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding implication is given by

$$a \to b = \begin{cases} 1, & a \leq b; \\ \max\{1 - a, b\}, & a > b. \end{cases}$$

In this case, $([0,1], \&)$ satisfies the law of double negation.

A $\mathcal{Q}$-order (or an order valued in the quantale $\mathcal{Q}$) [2, 28] on a set X is a reflexive and transitive $\mathcal{Q}$-relation on X. Explicitly, a $\mathcal{Q}$-order on X is a map $R\colon X \times X \longrightarrow Q$ such that $1 = R(x,x)$ and $R(y,x)\&R(x,y) \leq R(x,z)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$. The pair (X, R) is called a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set. As usual, we write X for the pair (X, R) and $X(x,y)$ for $R(x,y)$ if no confusion would arise.

If $R\colon X \times X \longrightarrow Q$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-order on X, then $R^{\mathrm{op}}\colon X \times X \longrightarrow Q$, given by $R^{\mathrm{op}}(x,y) = R(y,x)$, is also a $\mathcal{Q}$-order on X (by commutativity of $\&$), called the opposite of R.

A map $f\colon X \longrightarrow Y$ between $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered sets is $\mathcal{Q}$-order preserving if $X(x_1, x_2) \leq Y(f(x_1), f(x_2))$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$.

We write

$$\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{Ord}$$

for the category of $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered sets and $\mathcal{Q}$-order preserving maps.

Given a set X, a map $A\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is called a fuzzy set (valued in $\mathcal{Q}$), the value $A(x)$ is interpreted as the membership degree. The map

$$\mathrm{sub}_X\colon Q^X \times Q^X \longrightarrow Q,$$

given by

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} A(x) \to B(x),$$

defines a $\mathcal{Q}$-order on Q^X [2]. The value $\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B)$ measures the degree that A is contained in B. Thus, sub_X is called the *fuzzy inclusion order* on Q^X. In particular, if X is a singleton set then the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set (Q^X, sub_X) reduces to the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set (Q, d_L), where

$$d_L(p, q) = p \to q.$$

For any $p \in Q$ and $A \in Q^X$, write $p\&A, p \to A \in Q^X$ for the fuzzy sets given by $(p\&A)(x) = p\&A(x)$ and $(p \to A)(x) = p \to A(x)$, respectively. It is easy to check that

$$p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) \iff p\&A \leq B \iff A \leq p \to B$$

for all $p \in Q$ and $A, B \in Q^X$. In particular, $A \leq B$ if and only if $1 = \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B)$. Furthermore,

$$p \to \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(p\&A, B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(A, p \to B)$$

for all $p \in Q$ and $A, B \in Q^X$.

Given a map $f\colon X \longrightarrow Y$, as usual, define $f^{\rightarrow}\colon Q^X \longrightarrow Q^Y$ and $f^{\leftarrow}\colon Q^Y \longrightarrow Q^X$ by

$$f^{\rightarrow}(A)(y) = \bigvee_{f(x)=y} A(y), \quad f^{\leftarrow}(B)(x) = B \circ f(x).$$

The following proposition is a special case of the enriched Kan extension in category theory [10]. A direct verification is easy and can be found in e.g. [14].

Proposition 2.4. *For any map $f\colon X \longrightarrow Y$,*

(1) *$f^{\rightarrow}\colon (Q^X, \mathrm{sub}_X) \longrightarrow (Q^Y, \mathrm{sub}_Y)$ is $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving;*

(2) *$f^{\leftarrow}\colon (Q^Y, \mathrm{sub}_Y) \longrightarrow (Q^X, \mathrm{sub}_X)$ is $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving;*

(3) *$f^{\rightarrow}$ is left adjoint to $f^{\leftarrow}$, written $f^{\rightarrow} \dashv f^{\leftarrow}$, in the sense that*

$$\mathrm{sub}_Y(f^{\rightarrow}(A), B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(A, f^{\leftarrow}(B))$$

for all $A \in Q^X$ and $B \in Q^Y$.

An upper fuzzy set [15] in a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set X is a map $\psi\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ such that

$$X(x, y)\&\psi(x) \leq \psi(y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. It is clear that $\psi\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is an upper fuzzy set if and only if $\psi\colon X \longrightarrow (Q, d_L)$ is $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving.

Dually, a lower fuzzy set in a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set X is a map $\phi\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ such that

$$\phi(y)\&X(x, y) \leq \phi(x)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Or equivalently, $\phi\colon X^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow (Q, d_L)$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving map, where X^{op} is the opposite of the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set X.

Definition 2.5. A lower fuzzy set ϕ in a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set X is irreducible if $\bigvee_{x \in X} \phi(x) = 1$ and

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, \phi_1 \vee \phi_2) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, \phi_1) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, \phi_2)$$

for all lower fuzzy sets ϕ_1, ϕ_2 in X.

Irreducible lower fuzzy sets are a counterpart of directed lower sets in the $\mathcal{Q}$-setting. They play an essential role in this paper.

The following definition is taken from [3, 31].

Definition 2.6. A $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on a set X is a subset τ of Q^X subject to the following conditions:

(C1) $p_X \in \tau$ for all $p \in Q$;

(C2) $A \vee B \in \tau$ for all $A, B \in \tau$;

(C3) $\bigwedge_{j \in J} A_j \in \tau$ for each subfamily $\{A_j\}_{j \in J}$ of τ.

A $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ is stratified if

(C4) $p \to A \in \tau$ for all $p \in Q$ and $A \in \tau$.

A $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ is co-stratified if

(C5) $p\&A \in \tau$ for all $p \in Q$ and $A \in \tau$.

A $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ is strong if it is both stratified and co-stratified.

Example 2.7. [19] If $\mathcal{Q}$ is the quantale $([0,1], \min)$, then $\tau \subseteq [0,1]^X$ is a strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on X if and only if (X, τ^*) is a fuzzy neighborhood space in the sense of Lowen [18], where $\tau^* = \{1 - A \mid A \in \tau\}$. In general, if $\mathcal{Q}$ is the quantale obtained by endowing $[0,1]$ with a continuous t-norm T, then $\tau \subseteq [0,1]^X$ is a strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on X if and only if (X, τ^*) is a fuzzy T-neighborhood space in the sense of Morsi [19].

A function $f\colon (X, \tau_X) \longrightarrow (Y, \tau_Y)$ between $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces is continuous if $f^{\leftarrow}(A) = A \circ f$ is open in (X, τ_X) whenever A is open in (Y, τ_Y). $A \in \tau_Y$. We write

$$\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$$

for the category of $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces and continuous maps; and write

$$\mathsf{S}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$$

for the category of stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces and continuous maps. It is easily seen that both $\mathcal{Q}$-CTop and $\mathsf{S}\mathcal{Q}$-CTop are well-fibred topological categories over Set in the sense of [1].

Given a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space (X, τ), its closure operator $^-\colon Q^X \longrightarrow Q^X$ is defined by

$$\overline{A} = \bigwedge \{B \in \tau \mid A \leq B\}$$

for all $A \in Q^X$. The closure operator of a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space (X, τ) satisfies the following conditions: for all $A, B \in Q^X$,

(cl1) $\overline{p_X} = p_X$ for all $p \in Q$;

(cl2) $\overline{A} \geq A$;

(cl3) $\overline{A \vee B} = \overline{A} \vee \overline{B}$;

(cl4) $\overline{\overline{A}} = \overline{A}$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let X be a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space. The following are equivalent:*

(1) *X is stratified.*

(2) *$p\&\overline{A} \leq \overline{p\&A}$ for all $p \in Q$ and $A \in Q^X$.*

(3) *The closure operator $^-\colon (Q^X, \mathrm{sub}_X) \longrightarrow (Q^X, \mathrm{sub}_X)$ is $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Since $p \to \overline{p\&A}$ is closed and $A \leq p \to \overline{p\&A}$, it follows that $\overline{A} \leq p \to \overline{p\&A}$, hence $p\&\overline{A} \leq \overline{p\&A}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) For any $A, B \in Q^X$, let $p = \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = \bigwedge_{x \in X}(A(x) \to B(x))$. Since $p\&A \leq B$, then $p\&\overline{A} \leq \overline{p\&A} \leq \overline{B}$, hence $\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{A}, \overline{B})$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) Let A be a closed set and $p \in Q$. In order to see that $p \to A$ is also closed, it suffices to check that $\overline{p \to A} \leq p \to A$, or equivalently, $p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{p \to A}, A)$. This is easy since $p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(p \to A, A) \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{p \to A}, \overline{A}) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{p \to A}, A)$. □

It follows immediately from item (3) in the above proposition that if X is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space and B a closed set in X, then for all $A \in Q^X$,

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{A}, B) \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{A}, \overline{B}) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{A}, B),$$

hence

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{A}, B) \tag{2.1}$$

This equation will be useful in this paper.

Corollary 2.9. *In a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X,*

$$\overline{A} = \bigwedge \{\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) \to B \mid B \text{ is closed in } X\}$$

for all $A \in Q^X$.

Given a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space (X, τ), define $\Omega(\tau)\colon X \times X \longrightarrow Q$ by

$$\Omega(\tau)(x, y) = \bigwedge_{A \in \tau} (A(y) \to A(x)).$$

Then $\Omega(\tau)$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-order on X, called the specialization $\mathcal{Q}$-order of (X, τ) [15]. It is clear that each closed set in (X, τ) is a lower fuzzy set in the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set $(X, \Omega(\tau))$.

Usually, we write X, instead of (X, τ), for a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space. Accordingly, we write $\Omega(X)$ for the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set obtained by equipping X with its specialization $\mathcal{Q}$-order.

The correspondence $X \mapsto \Omega(X)$ defines a functor

$$\Omega\colon \mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{Ord}.$$

In particular, if $f\colon X \longrightarrow Y$ is a continuous map between $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces, then $f\colon \Omega(X) \longrightarrow \Omega(Y)$ is $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving, i.e., $\Omega(X)(x, y) \leq \Omega(Y)(f(x), f(y))$ for all $x, y \in X$.

Conversely, given a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set (X, R), the family $\Gamma(R)$ of lower fuzzy sets in (X, R) form a strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on X, called the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on (X, R). The correspondence $(X, R) \mapsto \Gamma(X, R) = (X, \Gamma(R))$ defines a functor

$$\Gamma\colon \mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{Ord} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$$

that is left adjoint to the functor Ω [3, 15].

The following conclusion says that in a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space, the specialization $\mathcal{Q}$-order is determined by closures of singletons, as in the classical case.

Proposition 2.10. *[24] If X is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space, then $\Omega(X)(x, y) = \overline{1_y}(x)$ for all $x, y \in X$.*

3 Sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces

Definition 3.1. A closed set F in a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X is irreducible if $\bigvee_{x \in X} F(x) = 1$ and

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A \vee B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(F, B) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(F, B)$$

for all closed fuzzy sets A, B in X.

Example 3.2. (1) Let X be a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space. Then for each $x \in X$, the closure $\overline{1_x}$ of 1_x is irreducible. This follows from that $\mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{1_x}, A) = A(x)$ for any closed set A in X.

(2) A lower fuzzy set ϕ in a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set X is irreducible in the sense of Definition 2.5 if and only if ϕ is an irreducible closed set in the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space $\Gamma(X)$.

Definition 3.3. A $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X is sober if it is stratified and each irreducible closed in X is the closure of 1_x for a unique $x \in X$.

A $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X is Hausdorff if the diagonal $\Delta\colon X \times X \longrightarrow Q$, given by

$$\Delta(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1, & x = y, \\ 0, & x \neq y, \end{cases}$$

is a closed set in the product space $X \times X$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (Q, \&)$ be a linearly ordered quantale. Then each stratified Hausdorff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space is sober.*

Proof. Let X be a stratified Hausdorff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space. In order to see that X is sober, it suffices to show that if F is an irreducible closed set in X, $F(x) > 0$ for at most one point in X.

Suppose on the contrary that there exist different x, y in X such that $F(x) > 0$ and $F(y) > 0$. Let $b = \min\{F(x), F(y)\}$. Then $b > 0$ by linearity of $\mathcal{Q}$. Since X is Hausdorff, there exist two families of closed sets in X, say, $\{A_j\}_{j\in J}$ and $\{B_j\}_{j\in J}$, such that

$$\Delta(x,y) = \bigwedge_{j\in J} A_j(x) \vee B_j(y).$$

Since $\Delta(x,y) = 0$, there exists some $i \in J$ such that $A_i(x) \vee B_i(y) < b$. Since $A_i(z) \vee B_i(z) = 1$ for all $z \in X$, we have either $F \leq A_i$ or $F \leq B_i$, hence either $F(x) < b$ or $F(y) < b$, a contradiction. □

Note 3.5. The assumption that $\mathcal{Q}$ is linearly ordered is indispensable in the above proposition. To see this, let $\mathcal{Q} = \{0, a, b, 1\}$ be the Boolean algebra with four elements; let X be the discrete $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space with two points x and y. It is clear that X is Hausdorff. One can verify by enumerating all possibilities that the map λ, given by $\lambda(x) = a$ and $\lambda(y) = b$, is an irreducible closed set in X, but, it is neither the closure of 1_x nor that of 1_y.

An element a in a lattice L is a coprime if for all $b, c \in L$, $a \leq b \vee c$ implies that either $a \leq b$ or $a \leq c$ [5]. A complete lattice L is said to have enough coprimes if every element in L can be written as the join of a family of coprimes. It is clear that every linearly ordered quantale has enough coprimes and the complete lattice of closed sets in a topological space has enough coprimes.

We say that an element in a quantale $\mathcal{Q} = (Q, \&)$ is a coprime if it is a coprime in the underlying lattice Q; and $\mathcal{Q}$ has enough coprimes if the complete lattice Q has enough coprimes.

It is easily seen that if $1 \in Q$ is a coprime and if F is an irreducible closed set in a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X, then for any closed fuzzy sets A, B in X, $F \leq A \vee B$ implies either $F \leq A$ or $F \leq B$. Said differently, an irreducible closed set in a $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space is a coprime in the lattice of its closed sets.

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quantale and X be a (crisp) topological space. We say that a map $\lambda\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is upper semicontinuous if for all $p \in Q$,

$$\lambda_{[p]} = \{x \in X \mid \lambda(x) \geq p\}$$

is a closed set in X.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quantale with enough coprimes and X be a topological space.*

(1) *$\lambda\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is upper semicontinuous if and only if $\lambda_{[p]}$ is a closed set in X for each coprime p in Q.*

(2) *If both $\lambda, \mu\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ are upper semicontinuous then so is $\lambda \vee \mu$.*

(3) *The meet of a family of upper semicontinuous maps is upper semicontinuous.*

(4) *If $\lambda\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is upper semicontinuous then so is $p \to \lambda$ for all $p \in Q$.*

Proof. (1) follows from that $\mathcal{Q}$ has enough coprimes and (2) is an immediate consequence of (1). The verification of (3) is straightforward. And (4) follows from that

$$(p \to \lambda)_{[q]} = \{x \in X \mid q \leq p \to \lambda(x)\} = \{x \in X \mid p\&q \leq \lambda(x)\} = \lambda_{[p\&q]}$$

for all $p, q \in Q$. □

The above lemma shows that if $\mathcal{Q}$ is a quantale with enough coprimes, then for each topological space X, the family of upper semicontinuous maps $X \longrightarrow Q$ form a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on X. We write $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ for the resulting stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space.

For each closed set K in X, $1_K\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is obviously upper semicontinuous, hence every closed set in X is also a closed in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$. Moreover, for any $A \subseteq X$, the closure of 1_A in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ equals $1_{\overline{A}}$, where $\overline{A}$ is the closure of A in X.

The correspondence $X \mapsto \omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ defines an embedding functor

$$\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}\colon \mathsf{Top} \longrightarrow \mathsf{S}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}.$$

The following conclusion says that for a linearly ordered quantale $\mathcal{Q}$, the notion of sobriety for $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces is a *good extension* [17].

Proposition 3.7. *If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a linearly ordered quantale, then a topological space X is a sober space if and only if $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ is a sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space.*

Proof. **Necessity**. Let λ be an irreducible closed in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$. Firstly, we show that for each $x \in X$, the value $\lambda(x)$ is either 0 or 1. Suppose on the contrary that there is some $x \in X$ such that $\lambda(x)$ is neither 0 nor 1. Let $\phi = 1_{\lambda_{[\lambda(x)]}}$ and ψ be the constant map $X \longrightarrow Q$ with value $\lambda(x)$. Then both ϕ and ψ are closed in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ and $\lambda \leq \phi \vee \psi$, but neither $\lambda \leq \phi$ nor $\lambda \leq \psi$, contradictory to that λ is irreducible. Therefore, $\lambda = 1_K$ for some closed set K in X. Since λ is irreducible in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$, K must be an irreducible closed set in X. Thus, in the topological space X, K is the closure of $\{x\}$ for a unique x, i.e., $K = \overline{\{x\}}$. This shows that in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$, λ is the closure of 1_x for a unique x. Therefore, $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ is sober.

Sufficiency. We prove a bit more, that is, if $\mathcal{Q}$ has enough coprimes and $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ is sober, then X is sober.

Let K be an irreducible closed set in X. Firstly, we show that 1_K is an irreducible closed set in the $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$. That $1_K\colon X \longrightarrow Q$ is upper semicontinuous is trivial. For any closed sets λ, μ in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$, one has by definition that

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda \vee \mu) = \bigwedge_{x \in K} (\lambda(x) \vee \mu(x)).$$

For any coprime $p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda \vee \mu)$, K is clearly a subset of $(\lambda \vee \mu)_{[p]} = \lambda_{[p]} \cup \mu_{[p]}$, hence either $K \subseteq \lambda_{[p]}$ or $K \subseteq \mu_{[p]}$, and then either $p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda)$ or $p \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \mu)$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda \vee \mu) \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \mu).$$

The converse inequality

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda \vee \mu) \geq \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \lambda) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(1_K, \mu)$$

is trivial. Thus, 1_K is an irreducible closed set in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$.

Since $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ is sober, there is a unique $x \in X$ such that 1_K is the closure of 1_x in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$. Because the closure of 1_x in $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ equals $1_{\overline{\{x\}}}$, one gets $K = \overline{\{x\}}$. □

Note 3.8. The assumption in Proposition 3.7 that $\mathcal{Q}$ is linearly ordered is indispensable. To see this, let $\mathcal{Q} = \{0, a, b, 1\}$ be the Boolean algebra with four elements; let X be the discrete (hence sober) topological space with two points x and y. It is clear that $\omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(X)$ is the discrete $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space in Note 3.5, hence it is not sober.

Write

$$\mathsf{Sob}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$$

for the full subcategory of $\mathsf{S}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$ consisting of sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces. We shall see that $\mathsf{Sob}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$ is reflective in $\mathsf{S}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$. For each stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X, the reflection of X in $\mathsf{Sob}\mathcal{Q}\text{-}\mathsf{CTop}$ is called the sobrification of X.

Given a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X, let

$$\mathrm{irr}(X)$$

denote the set of all irreducible closed sets in X. For each closed set A in X, define

$$s(A)\colon \mathrm{irr}(X) \longrightarrow Q$$

by

$$s(A)(F) = \mathrm{sub}_X(F, A).$$

Lemma 3.9. *Let X be a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space.*

(i) $s(p_X)(F) = p$ *for all* $p \in Q$ *and* $F \in \mathrm{irr}(X)$;

(ii) $s(A) = s(B) \Leftrightarrow A = B$ *for all closed sets* A, B *in* X;

(iii) $s(A \vee B) = s(A) \vee s(B)$ *for all closed sets* A, B *in* X;

(iv) $s\big(\bigwedge\limits_{j\in J} A_j\big) = \bigwedge\limits_{j\in J} s(A_j)$ *for each family* $\{A_j\}_{i\in J}$ *of closed sets in* X;

(v) $s(p \to A) = p \to s(A)$ *for all* $p \in Q$ *and all closed set* A *in* X;

(vi) $\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = \mathrm{sub}_{\mathrm{irr}(X)}(s(A), s(B))$ *for all closed sets* A, B *in* X.

Proof. We check (vi) for example. On one hand,

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) \leq \bigwedge_{F\in\mathrm{irr}(X)} (\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A) \to \mathrm{sub}_X(F, B)) = \mathrm{sub}_{\mathrm{irr}(X)}(s(A), s(B)).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{sub}_{\mathrm{irr}(X)}(s(A), s(B)) &= \bigwedge_{F\in\mathrm{irr}(X)} (s(A)(F) \to s(B)(F)) \\
&= \bigwedge_{F\in\mathrm{irr}(X)} (\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A) \to \mathrm{sub}_X(F, B)) \\
&\leq \bigwedge_{x\in X} (\mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{1_x}, A) \to \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{1_x}, B)) \\
&= \bigwedge_{x\in X} (A(x) \to B(x)) \\
&= \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. □

By the above lemma,

$$\{s(A) \mid A \text{ is a closed set of } X\ \}$$

is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on $\mathrm{irr}(X)$. We'll write $s(X)$, instead of $\mathrm{irr}(X)$, for the resulting $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space.

Proposition 3.10. *$s(X)$ is sober for each stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X.*

Proof. First of all, we note that for each irreducible closed set F in X, the closure of 1_F in $s(X)$ is given by $s(F)$. So, it suffices to show that for each closed set A in X, if $s(A)$ is irreducible in $s(X)$, then A is irreducible in X. We prove the conclusion in two steps.

Step 1. $\bigvee_{x\in X} A(x) = 1$. Since $s(A)$ is an irreducible closed set in $s(X)$, it holds that

$$\bigvee_{F\in s(X)} s(A)(F) = \bigvee_{F\in s(X)} \mathrm{sub}_X(F, A) = 1.$$

Since for each $F \in s(X)$ and $x \in X$,

$$F(x)\&\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A) = F(x)\& \bigwedge_{z\in X} (F(z) \to A(z)) \le A(x),$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\bigvee_{x\in X} A(x) &\ge \bigvee_{x\in X}\bigvee_{F\in s(X)} F(x)\&\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A)\\ &= \bigvee_{F\in s(X)}\bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A)\\ &= \bigvee_{F\in s(X)} \mathrm{sub}_X(F, A)\\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. $\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B \vee C) = (\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B)) \vee (\mathrm{sub}_X(A, C))$ for all closed sets B, C in X. Since $s(A)$ is irreducible in $s(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B \vee C) &= \mathrm{sub}_{s(X)}(s(A), s(B \vee C))\\ &= \mathrm{sub}_{s(X)}(s(A), s(B) \vee s(C))\\ &= \mathrm{sub}_{s(X)}(s(A), s(B)) \vee \mathrm{sub}_{s(X)}(s(A), s(C))\\ &= \mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(A, C).\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. □

Proposition 3.11. *For a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X, define*

$$\eta_X \colon X \longrightarrow s(X)$$

by $\eta_X(x) = \overline{1_x}$. Then

(1) *$\eta_X \colon X \longrightarrow s(X)$ is continuous.*

(2) *X is sober if and only if η_X is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. (1) For any closed set A in X and $x \in X$,

$$\eta_X^{\leftarrow}(s(A))(x) = s(A)(\eta_X(x)) = A(x),$$

hence $\eta_X^{\leftarrow}(s(A)) = A$. This shows that f is continuous.

(2) If X is sober then each irreducible closed set in X is of the form $\overline{1_x} = \eta_X(x)$ for a unique $x \in X$, hence $\eta_X \colon X \longrightarrow s(X)$ is a bijection. Since for each closed set A in X and $x \in X$,

$$\eta_X^{\rightarrow}(A)(\overline{1_x}) = \bigvee \{A(z) \mid \eta_X(z) = \overline{1_x}\} = A(x) = s(A)(\overline{1_x}),$$

it follows that $\eta_X^{\rightarrow}(A) = s(A)$. This shows that η_X is a continuous closed bijection, hence a homeomorphism. The converse conclusion is trivial, since $s(X)$ is sober by Proposition 3.10. □

Theorem 3.12. *Let $f\colon X \to Y$ be a continuous map between stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces. If Y is sober, there is a unique continuous map $f^*\colon s(X) \longrightarrow Y$ such that $f = f^* \circ \eta_X$.*



Lemma 3.13. *Let $f\colon X \to Y$ be a continuous map between stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces. Then for each irreducible closed set F of X, the closure $\overline{f^{\to}(F)}$ of the image of F under f is an irreducible closed set of Y.*

Proof. For any closed sets A, B in Y,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{sub}_Y(\overline{f^{\to}(F)}, A \vee B) &= \mathrm{sub}_Y(f^{\to}(F), A \vee B) && (A \vee B \text{ is closed})\\
&= \mathrm{sub}_X(F, f^{\leftarrow}(A \vee B) && (f^{\to} \dashv f^{\leftarrow})\\
&= \mathrm{sub}_X(F, f^{\leftarrow}(A)) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(F, f^{\leftarrow}(B)) && (F \text{ is irreducible})\\
&= \mathrm{sub}_Y(f^{\to}(F), A) \vee \mathrm{sub}_Y(f^{\to}(F), B)\\
&= \mathrm{sub}_Y(\overline{f^{\to}(F)}, A) \vee \mathrm{sub}_Y(\overline{f^{\to}(F)}, B),
\end{aligned}$$

hence $\overline{f^{\to}(F)}$ is irreducible. □

Proof of Theorem 3.12. **Existence**. For each $F \in s(X)$, since $\overline{f^{\to}(F)}$ is an irreducible closed set of Y and Y is sober, there is a unique $y \in Y$ such that $\overline{f^{\to}(F)}$ equals the closure of 1_y. Define $f^*(F)$ to be this y. We claim that $f^*\colon s(X) \longrightarrow Y$ satisfies the conditions.

First, we show that $B \circ f^*$ is a closed set in $s(X)$ for any closed set B in Y, hence f^* is continuous. Let A be the closed set $f^{\leftarrow}(B) = B \circ f$ in X. Then for any $F \in s(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
s(A)(F) &= \mathrm{sub}_X(F, f^{\leftarrow}(B)) = \mathrm{sub}_Y(f^{\to}(F), B)\\
&= \mathrm{sub}_Y(\overline{f^{\to}(F)}, B) = \mathrm{sub}_Y(\overline{1_{f^*(F)}}, B)\\
&= B(f^*(F)) = B \circ f^*(F),
\end{aligned}$$

thus, $B \circ f^* = s(A)$ and is closed in $s(X)$.

Second, for any $x \in X$, since

$$1_{f(x)} \le f^{\to}(\overline{1_x}) \le \overline{f^{\to}(1_x)} = \overline{1_{f(x)}},$$

it follows that

$$\overline{1_{f(x)}} = \overline{f^{\to}(\overline{1_x})} = \overline{f^{\to}(\eta_X(x))},$$

hence $f^* \circ \eta_X(x) = f(x)$.

Therefore, $f^*\colon s(X) \longrightarrow Y$ satisfies the conditions.

Uniqueness. Since Y is sober, it suffices to show that if $g\colon s(X) \longrightarrow Y$ is a continuous map such that $f = g \circ \eta_X$, then $\overline{1_{g(F)}} = \overline{f^{\to}(F)}$ for all $F \in s(X)$.

Since for any $E \in s(X)$,

$$\Omega(s(X))(E, F) = \overline{1_F}(E) = \mathrm{sub}_X(E, F),$$

it follows that for any $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
F(x) &= \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{1_x}, F)\\
&= \Omega(s(X))(\eta_X(x), F)\\
&\le \Omega(Y)(g(\eta_X(x)), g(F))\\
&= \Omega(Y)(f(x), g(F))\\
&= \overline{1_{g(F)}}(f(x)),
\end{aligned}$$

showing that $f^{\rightarrow}(F) \leq \overline{1_{g(F)}}$, hence $\overline{f^{\rightarrow}(F)} \leq \overline{1_{g(F)}}$.

Conversely, since $\overline{\eta_X^{\rightarrow}(F)}$ is closed in $s(X)$, there is some closed set A in X such that $\overline{\eta_X^{\rightarrow}(F)} = s(A)$. For any $x \in X$, since $F(x) \leq \eta_X^{\rightarrow}(F)(\eta_X(x)) \leq s(A)(\eta_X(x)) = A(x)$, it follows that $F \leq A$, then

$$g^{\rightarrow}(s(A)) = g^{\rightarrow}(\overline{\eta_X^{\rightarrow}(F)}) \leq \overline{g^{\rightarrow} \circ \eta_X^{\rightarrow}(F)} = \overline{f^{\rightarrow}(F)},$$

hence $\overline{f^{\rightarrow}(F)}(g(F)) \geq g^{\rightarrow}(s(A))(g(F)) \geq s(A)(F) = 1$. Therefore, $\overline{1_{g(F)}} \leq \overline{f^{\rightarrow}(F)}$. □

Theorem 3.12 shows that the full subcategory of sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces is reflective in $\mathsf{SQ\text{-}CTop}$. For any $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X, the sober space $s(X)$ is called the sobrification of X.

It is well-known that the specialization order of a sober space is directed complete, see e.g. [9]. The following Proposition 3.15 says this is also true in the $\mathcal{Q}$-setting if we treat irreducible lower fuzzy sets as "directed lower fuzzy sets".

Definition 3.14. [28, 14] A supremum of a lower fuzzy set ϕ in a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set is an element $\sup \phi$ in X such that

$$X(\sup \phi, x) = \bigwedge_{z \in X} (\phi(z) \to X(z, x)) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, X(-, x))$$

for all $x \in X$.

The notion of supremum of a lower fuzzy set in a $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set is a special case of that of *weighted colimit* in category theory [10].

Proposition 3.15. *Let X be a sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space. Then each irreducible fuzzy lower set in the specialization $\mathcal{Q}$-order of X has a supremum.*

Proof. Let ϕ be an irreducible fuzzy lower set in the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set $\Omega(X)$. First, we show that the closure $\overline{\phi}$ of ϕ in X is an irreducible closed set. Let A, B be closed sets in X. By definition of the specialization $\mathcal{Q}$-order, both A and B are lower fuzzy sets in $\Omega(X)$. Hence

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{\phi}, A \vee B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, A \vee B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, A) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{\phi}, A) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{\phi}, B),$$

showing that $\overline{\phi}$ is an irreducible closed set in X. Since X is sober, there is a unique $a \in X$ such that $\overline{\phi} = \overline{1_a}$. We claim that a is a supremum of ϕ in $\Omega(X)$, i.e.,

$$\Omega(X)(a, x) = \bigwedge_{z \in X} (\phi(z) \to \Omega(X)(z, x))$$

for all $x \in X$. On one hand, for each $z \in X$, since $\phi(z) \leq \overline{\phi}(z) = \overline{1_a}(z) = \Omega(z, a)$, it follows that

$$\phi(z) \to \Omega(X)(z, x) \geq \Omega(z, a) \to \Omega(X)(z, x) \geq \Omega(X)(a, x),$$

hence

$$\Omega(X)(a, x) \leq \bigwedge_{z \in X} (\phi(z) \to \Omega(X)(z, x)).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigwedge_{z \in X} (\phi(z) \to \Omega(X)(z, x)) &= \mathrm{sub}_X(\phi, \overline{1_x}) && (\overline{1_x}(z) = \Omega(X)(z, x)) \\
&= \mathrm{sub}_X(\overline{\phi}, \overline{1_x}) && (\overline{1_x} \text{ is closed}) \\
&\leq \overline{\phi}(a) \to \overline{1_x}(a) \\
&= \Omega(X)(a, x). && (\overline{\phi}(a) = 1)
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

At the end of this section, we discuss the relationship between sober $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces and sober $\mathcal{Q}$-topological spaces in the case that the quantale $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies the law of double negation.

Definition 3.16. A $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on a set X is a subset τ of Q^X subject to the following conditions:

(O1) $p_X \in \tau$ for all $p \in Q$;

(O2) $U \wedge V \in \tau$ for all $U, V \in \tau$;

(O3) $\bigvee_{j\in J} U_j \in \tau$ for each subfamily $\{U_j\}_{j\in J}$ of τ.

Such a $\mathcal{Q}$-topological space is also called a *weakly stratified* $\mathcal{Q}$-topological space in the literature, see e.g. [8]. A $\mathcal{Q}$-topology τ is stratified [8] if

(O4) $p\&U \in \tau$ for all $p \in Q$ and $U \in \tau$.

It is clear that if $\mathcal{Q} = (Q, \&)$ is a frame, i.e., if $\& = \wedge$, then every $\mathcal{Q}$-topology is stratified.

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quantale that satisfies the law of double negation. If τ is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on a set X, then

$$\neg(\tau) = \{\neg A \mid A \in \tau\}$$

is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on X, where $\neg A(x) = \neg(A(x))$ for all $x \in X$. Conversely, if τ is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on X, then

$$\neg(\tau) = \{\neg A \mid A \in \tau\}$$

is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on X.

If $\mathcal{Q} = (Q, \&)$ satisfies the law of double negation, then for any $A, B \in Q^X$,

$$\mathrm{sub}_X(A, B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(\neg B, \neg A) \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\bigvee_{x\in X} A(x)\&B(x) = \neg\mathrm{sub}_X(A, \neg B) = \neg\mathrm{sub}_X(B, \neg A) \tag{3.2}$$

These equations are clearly extensions of the properties listed in Proposition 2.2.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quantale that satisfies the law of double negation; and let (X, τ) be a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space. Then for each irreducible closed set F in (X, τ), the map*

$$f_F \colon \neg(\tau) \longrightarrow Q, \quad f_F(U) = \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x)$$

satisfies the following conditions:

(Fr1) $f_F(p_X) = p$.

(Fr2) $f_F(U \wedge V) = f_F(U) \wedge f_F(V)$.

(Fr3) $f_F\big(\bigvee_{i\in I} U_i\big) = \bigvee_{i\in I} f_F(U_i)$.

(Fr4) $f_F(p\&U) = p\&f_F(U)$.

Conversely, if $g \colon \neg(\tau) \longrightarrow Q$ is a map satisfying (Fr1)–(Fr4)*, then there is a unique irreducible closed set F in (X, τ) such that $g = f_F$.*

Proof. We check (Fr2) for example.

$$\begin{aligned} f_F(U \wedge V) &= \neg(\mathrm{sub}_X(U \wedge V, \neg F)) \\ &= \neg(\mathrm{sub}_X(F, \neg(U \wedge V))) \\ &= \neg(\mathrm{sub}_X(F, \neg U \vee \neg V)) \\ &= \neg(\mathrm{sub}_X(F, \neg U) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(F, \neg V)) \\ &= \neg(\mathrm{sub}_X(U, \neg F)) \wedge \neg(\mathrm{sub}_X(V, \neg F)) \\ &= f_F(U) \wedge f_F(V). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose $g\colon \neg(\tau) \longrightarrow Q$ is a map that satisfies (Fr1)–(Fr4). Let

$$F = \bigwedge\{A \in \tau \mid g(\neg A) = 0\}.$$

We show that F is an irreducible closed set in (X, τ) and $g = f_F$.

Step 1. $g(\neg F) = 0$. This follows from (Fr3) and Proposition 2.2(3).

Step 2. $g(U) = \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x)$ for all $U \in \neg(\tau)$. On one hand, if we let $p = \mathrm{sub}_X(U, \neg F)$, then $p\&U \leq \neg F$, hence

$$p\&g(U) = g(p\&U) \leq g(\neg F) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$g(U) \leq \neg\mathrm{sub}_X(U, \neg F) = \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x).$$

On the other hand, since $g(\neg(g(U))\&U) = \neg(g(U))\&g(U) = 0$, it follows that $\neg(g(U))\&U \leq \neg F$ by definition of F. Therefore, $\neg(g(U)) \leq \mathrm{sub}_X(U, \neg F)$, hence

$$g(U) \geq \neg\mathrm{sub}_X(U, \neg F) = \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x).$$

Step 3. $\bigvee_{x\in X} F(x) = 1$. Otherwise, let $\bigwedge_{x\in X} \neg F(x) = p$. Then $p \neq 0$ and $p_X \leq \neg F$. Therefore, $g(\neg F) \geq g(p_X) = p$, contradictory to that $g(\neg F) = 0$.

Step 4. $\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A \vee B) = \mathrm{sub}_X(F, A) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(F, B)$ for all closed sets A, B in (X, τ). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{sub}_X(F, A \vee B) &= \mathrm{sub}_X(\neg A \wedge \neg B, \neg F) \\
&= \neg(g(\neg A \wedge \neg B)) \\
&= \neg(g(\neg A)) \vee \neg(g(\neg B)) \\
&= \mathrm{sub}_X(\neg A, \neg F) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(\neg B, \neg F) \\
&= \mathrm{sub}_X(F, A) \vee \mathrm{sub}_X(F, B).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. □

It is clear that if (X, τ) is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topological space, then for each $x \in X$, the map

$$f_x\colon \tau \longrightarrow Q, \quad f_x(U) = U(x)$$

satisfies (FR1)–(FR4) in Proposition 3.17. This fact leads to the following:

Definition 3.18. A stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topological space (X, τ) is sober if for each map $f\colon \tau \longrightarrow Q$ satisfying (FR1)–(FR4) in Proposition 3.17, there is a unique $x \in X$ such that $f(U) = U(x)$ for all $U \in \tau$.

We leave it to the reader to check that if $\mathcal{Q} = (Q, \&)$ is a frame, then the above definition of sober $\mathcal{Q}$-topological spaces coincides with that in [32].

Proposition 3.19. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quantale that satisfies the law of double negation. Then a $\mathcal{Q}$-topological space (X, τ) is sober if and only if the $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space $(X, \neg(\tau))$ is sober.*

Proof. **Necessity**: Let F be an irreducible closed set in the $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space $(X, \neg(\tau))$. By Proposition 3.17, the map

$$f_F\colon \tau \longrightarrow Q, \quad f_F(U) = \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x)$$

satisfies (Fr1)–(Fr4), hence there is a unique $a \in X$ such that $f_F(U) = U(a)$ for all $U \in \tau$. We claim that the closure of 1_a in $(X, \neg(\tau))$ is F. Since

$$\neg F(a) = f_F(\neg F) = \bigvee_{x\in X} \neg F(x)\&F(x) = 0,$$

then $F(a) = 1$. Therefore, $\overline{1_a} \leq F$. Conversely, since

$$\bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&\neg(\overline{1_a})(x) = f_F(\neg(\overline{1_a})) = \neg(\overline{1_a})(a) = 0,$$

it follows that

$$F(x) \leq \neg(\neg(\overline{1_a})(x)) = \overline{1_a}(x)$$

for all $x \in X$, hence $F \leq \overline{1_a}$.

Sufficiency. Let $f\colon \tau \longrightarrow Q$ be a map satisfying (FR1)–(FR4). By Proposition 3.17, there is an irreducible closed set F in the $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space $(X, \neg(\tau))$ such that $f(U) = \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x)$ for all $U \in \tau$. Since $(X, \neg(\tau))$ is sober, there is a unique $a \in X$ such that $\overline{1_a} = F$, Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f(U) &= \bigvee_{x\in X} F(x)\&U(x) \\ &= \neg\mathrm{sub}_X(F, \neg U) \\ &= \neg\mathrm{sub}_X(1_a, \neg U) \\ &= U(a), && (\neg U \text{ is closed}) \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

4 Examples

This section discusses the sobriety of some natural $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces in the case that $\mathcal{Q}$ is the unit interval $[0, 1]$ endowed with a (left) continuous t-norm. In this section, we'll write $\underline{a}$, instead of $a_{[0,1]}$, for the constant map $[0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ with value a.

Given a (left) continuous t-norm & on $[0, 1]$, we consider three $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopologies on $[0, 1]$:

- $\tau_{C\&}$: the stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on $[0, 1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ as a subbasis;
- $\tau_{S\&}$: the strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on $[0, 1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ as a subbasis;
- $\tau_{A\&}$: the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set $([0, 1], d_R)$, where $d_R(x, y) = y \to x$.

First of all, we list some facts about these $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopologies.

(F1) A closed set in $([0, 1], \tau_{A\&})$ is, by definition, a $\mathcal{Q}$-order-preserving map $\phi\colon ([0, 1], d_L) \longrightarrow ([0, 1], d_L)$, where $d_L(x, y) = x \to y$. So, it is easy to verify that for all $\phi \in \tau_{A\&}$:

- ϕ is increasing, i.e., $\phi(x) \leq \phi(y)$ whenever $x \leq y$;
- $\phi(1) = 1 \iff \phi \geq \mathrm{id}$.

(F2) For each $x \in [0, 1]$, the closure of 1_x in $([0, 1], \tau_{A\&})$ is $x \to \mathrm{id}$, i.e.,

$$\overline{1_x} = x \to \mathrm{id}.$$

On one hand, $x \to \mathrm{id}$ is a closed set in $([0, 1], \tau_{A\&})$ and $(x \to \mathrm{id})(x) = 1$, hence $\overline{1_x} \leq x \to \mathrm{id}$. On the other hand, for any $\psi \in \tau_{A\&}$, if $\psi(x) = 1$, then $\psi(t) = \psi(x) \to \psi(t) \geq x \to t$ for all $t \leq x$, hence $\psi \geq x \to \mathrm{id}$.

(F3) Since every Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology is a strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology and $\mathrm{id} \in \tau_{A\&}$, it follows that

$$\tau_{C\&} \subseteq \tau_{S\&} \subseteq \tau_{A\&}.$$

Moreover, since $x \to \mathrm{id} \in \tau_{C\&}$ for all $x \in X$, then the closure of 1_x in both $([0, 1], \tau_{C\&})$ and $([0, 1], \tau_{S\&})$ equals $x \to \mathrm{id}$.

(F4) Since finite joins and arbitrary meets of right continuous maps $[0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$ are right continuous, $x \to \mathrm{id}$ is right continuous for all $x \in [0,1]$, it follows that every closed set in $([0,1], \tau_{C\&})$, as a map from $[0,1]$ to itself, is right continuous.

(F5) The space $([0,1], \tau_{C\&})$ is finally dense in the category of stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological spaces. Indeed, a fuzzy set $A\colon X \longrightarrow [0,1]$ of a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space X is a closed set if and only if $A\colon X \longrightarrow ([0,1], \tau_{C\&})$ is continuous.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = ([0,1], \&)$ with $\&$ being a left continuous t-norm on $[0,1]$. Then the stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space $([0,1], \tau_{C\&})$ is sober.*

Proof. It suffices to show that if ϕ is an irreducible closed set in $([0,1], \tau_{C\&})$, then $\phi = x \to \mathrm{id} = \overline{1_x}$ for some $x \in [0,1]$. Since ϕ is increasing and $\bigvee_{t\in[0,1]} \phi(t) = 1$, one obtains that $\phi(1) = 1$. Let

$$x = \inf\{t \in [0,1] \mid \phi(t) = 1\}.$$

Since ϕ is right continuous by (F4), then $\phi(x) = 1$, hence $\phi \geq \overline{1_x} = x \to \mathrm{id}$. We claim that $\phi = x \to \mathrm{id}$. Otherwise, there is some $t < x$ such that $\phi(t) > x \to t$. Since $x \to t = \bigwedge_{y<x}(y \to t)$, there is some $y \in (t, x)$ such that $\phi(t) > y \to t$. It is clear both $y \to \mathrm{id}$ and $\underline{\phi(y)}$ belong to $\tau_{C\&}$ and $\phi \leq (y \to \mathrm{id}) \vee \underline{\phi(y)}$, but neither $\phi \leq (y \to \mathrm{id})$ nor $\phi \leq \underline{\phi(y)}$, contradictory to the assumption that ϕ is irreducible. □

In the following we consider sobriety of the $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopologies $\tau_{S\&}$ and $\tau_{A\&}$ in the case that $\&$ is the minimum t-norm, the product t-norm and the Łukasiewicz t-norm.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = ([0,1], \&)$ with $\&$ being the t-norm* min*. Then the strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{SM} on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ is sober; but the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{AM} on the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set $([0,1], d_R)$ is not sober.*

Proof. First of all, since $\& = \min$, every stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space is obviously a strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopological space, then the strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{SM} on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ coincides with stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{CM} on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$, hence it is sober by Proposition 4.1.

By aid of Example 3.12 in [15], it can be verified that

$$\tau_{AM} = \{\phi \wedge \underline{a} \mid a \in [0,1], \phi\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1] \text{ is increasing}, \phi \geq \mathrm{id}\}.$$

For any $a \in (0,1)$, the map $\phi\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$, given by

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t > a, \\ t, & t \leq a, \end{cases}$$

is an irreducible closed set in $([0,1], \tau_{AM})$, and it is not the closure of 1_x for any $x \in [0,1]$, so, $([0,1], \tau_{AM})$ is not sober. □

We would like to record here that

$$\tau_{CM} = \tau_{SM} = \{\phi \in \tau_{AM} \mid \phi \text{ is right continuous}\}.$$

It is easily verified that $\mathcal{C} = \{\phi \in \tau_{AM} \mid \phi \text{ is right continuous}\}$ is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on $[0,1]$ that contains the identity id, hence $\tau_{CM} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. To see that $\mathcal{C}$ is contained in τ_{CM}, we show firstly that $\phi \in \tau_{CM}$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\phi(1) = 1$. To this end, for each $x \in [0,1]$, define $g_x\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$ by $g_x = \underline{\phi(x)} \vee (x \to \mathrm{id})$, i.e.,

$$g_x(t) = \phi(x) \vee (x \to t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \geq x, \\ \phi(x), & t < x. \end{cases}$$

Then $g_x \in \tau_{CM}$. Since

$$\phi = \bigwedge_{x\in[0,1]} g_x = \bigwedge_{x\in[0,1]} (\underline{\phi(x)} \vee (x \to \mathrm{id})),$$

it follows that $\phi \in \tau_{CM}$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = ([0,1], \&)$ with $\&$ being the product t-norm. Then the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{AP} on $([0,1], d_R)$ is not sober; but the strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{SP} on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ is sober.*

Proof. By Example 3.11 in [15], he Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{AP} consists of maps $\phi\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$ subject to the following conditions:

(i) ϕ is increasing; and

(ii) $y/x \leq \phi(y)/\phi(x)$ whenever $x > y$, where we agree by convention that $0/0 = 1$.

We note that each ϕ in τ_{AP} is continuous on $(0,1]$, but it may be discontinuous at 0.

It is easy to verify that the map $\phi\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$, given by

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t > 0, \\ 0, & t = 0, \end{cases}$$

is an irreducible closed set in $([0,1], \tau_{AP})$, but it is not the closure of 1_x for any $x \in [0,1]$. So, $([0,1], \tau_{AP})$ is not sober.

In the following we prove in three steps that the strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{SP} on $[0,1]$ is sober.

Step 1. We show that the stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{CP} on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ is given by

$$\tau_{CP} = \{\phi \wedge \underline{a} \mid a \in [0,1], \phi \in \mathcal{B}\},$$

where,

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\phi \in \tau_{AP} \mid \phi \geq \mathrm{id}, \phi \text{ is continuous}\}.$$

It is routine to verify that $\mathcal{C} = \{\phi \wedge \underline{a} \mid a \in [0,1], \phi \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on $[0,1]$ that contains the identity id, hence $\tau_{CP} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. To see that $\mathcal{C}$ is contained in τ_{CP}, it suffices to check that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau_{CP}$. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$. For each $x \in (0,1]$, define $g_x\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$ by

$$g_x = \underline{\phi(x)} \vee ((\phi(x) \to x) \to t) = \underline{\phi(x)} \vee \Big(\frac{x}{\phi(x)} \to \mathrm{id}\Big).$$

Then $g_x \in \tau_{CP}$. We leave it to the reader to check that

$$\phi = \bigwedge_{x \in (0,1]} g_x = \bigwedge_{x \in (0,1]} \Big(\underline{\phi(x)} \vee \Big(\frac{x}{\phi(x)} \to \mathrm{id}\Big)\Big),$$

hence $\phi \in \tau_{CP}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \tau_{CP}$.

Step 2. We show that

$$\tau_{SP} = \{\phi \in \tau_{AP} \mid \phi \text{ is continuous}\}.$$

It is easily verified that $\mathcal{S} = \{\phi \in \tau_{AP} \mid \phi \text{ is continuous}\}$ is a strong $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on $[0,1]$ that contains the identity id, hence $\tau_{SP} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Conversely, for any $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\phi(1) > 0$, let $\psi = \phi(1) \to \phi = \phi/\phi(1)$. Then $\psi \in \tau_{AP}$, $\psi(1) = 1$, and ψ is continuous. Thus, $\psi \in \mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau_{SP}$. Since τ_{SP} is strong and $\phi = \phi(1) \& \psi$, it follows that $\phi \in \tau_{SP}$, hence $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \tau_{SP}$.

Step 3. $([0,1], \tau_{SP})$ is sober. Suppose ϕ is an irreducible closed set in $([0,1], \tau_{SP})$. Since ϕ is increasing and $\bigvee_{t \in [0,1]} \phi(t) = 1$, one has $\phi(1) = 1$, hence $\phi \in \mathcal{B} \subset \tau_{CP}$. Since τ_{CP} is coarser than τ_{SP}, it follows that ϕ is an irreducible closed set in the sober space $([0,1], \tau_{CP})$, then $\phi = x \to \mathrm{id}$ for a unique $x \in [0,1]$. This shows that ϕ is the closure of 1_x for a unique $x \in [0,1]$ in $([0,1], \tau_{SP})$, hence $([0,1], \tau_{SP})$ is sober. □

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = ([0,1], \&)$ with $\&$ being the Łukasiewicz t-norm. Then the strong $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{SL} on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$ is sober and coincides with the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{AL} on the $\mathcal{Q}$-ordered set $([0,1], d_R)$.*

Proof. By Example 3.10 in [15], the Alexandroff $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology τ_{AL} on $([0,1], d_R)$ consists of maps $\phi\colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$ that satisfy the following conditions:

(i) ϕ is increasing; and

(ii) ϕ is 1-Lipschitz, i.e., $\phi(x) - \phi(y) \leq x - y$ for all $x \geq y$.

Firstly, we show that

$$\tau_{CL} = \{\phi \wedge \underline{a} \mid a \in [0,1], \phi \in \tau_{AL}, \phi \geq \mathrm{id}\},$$

where, τ_{CL} denotes the stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-cotopology on $[0,1]$ generated by $\{\mathrm{id}\}$. It is routine to verify that $\mathcal{C} = \{\phi \wedge \underline{a} \mid a \in [0,1], \phi \in \tau_{AL}, \phi \geq \mathrm{id}\}$ is a stratified $\mathcal{Q}$-topology on $[0,1]$ that contains the identity id, hence $\tau_{CL} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. To see that $\mathcal{C}$ is contained in τ_{CL}, it suffices to check that for any $\phi \in \tau_{AL}$, if $\phi \geq \mathrm{id}$ then $\phi \in \tau_{CL}$. For each $x \in [0,1]$, define $g_x \colon [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$ by

$$g_x = \underline{\phi(x)} \vee ((\phi(x) \to x) \to \mathrm{id}),$$

i.e.,

$$g_x(t) = \max\{\phi(x), \min\{\phi(x) + t - x, 1\}\}.$$

Then $g_x \in \tau_{CL}$. We leave it to the reader to check that

$$\phi = \bigwedge_{x \in [0,1]} g_x = \bigwedge_{x \in [0,1]} (\underline{\phi(x)} \vee ((\phi(x) \to x) \to \mathrm{id})),$$

hence $\phi \in \tau_{CL}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \tau_{CL}$.

Secondly, we show that $\tau_{SL} = \tau_{AL}$. For any $\phi \in \tau_{AL}$ with $\phi(1) > 0$, it is clear that $\phi(1) \to \phi \in \tau_{AL}$ and $(\phi(1) \to \phi)(1) = 1$. Thus, $\phi(1) \to \phi \in \tau_{CL} \subseteq \tau_{SL}$. Since τ_{SL} is strong and $\phi = \phi(1) \& (\phi(1) \to \phi)$, it follows that $\phi \in \tau_{SL}$, hence $\tau_{AL} \subseteq \tau_{SL}$. The converse inclusion $\tau_{SL} \subseteq \tau_{AL}$ is trivial.

Finally, we show that $([0,1], \tau_{SL})$ is sober. Let ϕ be an irreducible closed set in $([0,1], \tau_{SL})$. Since ϕ is increasing and $\bigvee_{t \in [0,1]} \phi(t) = 1$, then $\phi(1) = 1$, hence $\phi \in \tau_{CL}$. Since τ_{CL} is coarser than τ_{SL}, it follows that ϕ is an irreducible closed set in the sober space $([0,1], \tau_{CL})$, hence $\phi = x \to \mathrm{id}$ for a unique $x \in [0,1]$. This shows that ϕ is the closure of 1_x for a unique $x \in [0,1]$ in $([0,1], \tau_{SL})$, hence $([0,1], \tau_{SL})$ is sober. □

Acknowledgement The author thanks sincerely Dr. Hongliang Lai for stimulating discussions during the preparation of this paper.

References

[1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, G.E. Strecker, Abstract and Concrete Categories, Wiley, New York, 1990.

[2] R. Bělohlávek, Fuzzy Relational Systems: Foundations and Principles, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.

[3] P. Chen, D. Zhang, Alexandroff L-cotopological spaces, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 161 (2010) 2505-2514.

[4] P. Chen, H. Lai, D. Zhang, Coreflective hull of finite strong L-topological spaces, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 182 (2011) 79-92.

[5] G. Gierz, K.H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J.D. Lawson, M. Mislove, D.S. Scott, Continuous Lattices and Domains, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 93, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[6] J. Gutiérrez García, U. Höhle, M.A. de Prada Vicente, On lattice-valued frames: The completely distributive case, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 161 (2010) 1022-1030.

[7] P. Hájek, Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1998.

[8] U. Höhle, A.P. Šostak, Axiomatic foundition of fixed-basis fuzzy topology, in: U. Höhle, S.E. Rodabaugh, (Eds.), Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets: Logic, Topology and Measure Theory, Springer, 1999, pp. 123-272.

[9] P.T. Johnstone, Stone Spaces, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.

[10] G.M. Kelly, Basic Concepts of Enriched Category Theory, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, Vol. 64, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.

[11] E.P. Klement, R. Mesiar, E. Pap, Triangular Norms, Trends in Logic, Vol. 8, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.

[12] W. Kotzé, Fuzzy sobriety and fuzzy Hausdorff, Quaestiones Mathematicae 20 (1997) 415-422

[13] W. Kotzé, Sobriety and semi-sobriety of L-topological spaces, Quaestiones Mathematicae 24 (2001) 549-554.

[14] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Complete and directed complete Ω-categories, Theoretical Computer Science 388 (2007) 1-25.

[15] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Fuzzy preorder and fuzzy topology, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 157 (2006) 1865-1885.

[16] F.W. Lawevere, Metric spaces, genetalized logic, and closed categories, Rendiconti del Seminario Matématico e Fisico di Milano 43 (1973) 135-166.

[17] R. Lowen, Fuzzy topological spaces and fuzzy compactness, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 56 (1976) 621-633.

[18] R. Lowen, Fuzzy neighborhood spaces, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 7 (1982) 165-189.

[19] N.N. Morsi, On two types of stable subconstructs of **FTS**, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 76 (1995) 191-203.

[20] A. Pultr, S.E. Rodabaugh, Lattice-valued frames, functor categories, and classes of sober spaces, in: S.E. Rodabaugh, E.P. Klement(Eds.), Topological and Algebraic Structures in Fuzzy Sets: A Handbook of Recent Developments in the Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, 2003, pp. 153-187.

[21] A. Pultr, S.E. Rodabaugh, Examples for different sobrieties in fixed-basis topology, in: S.E. Rodabaugh, E.P. Klement(Eds.), Topological and Algebraic Structures in Fuzzy Sets: A Handbook of Recent Developments in the Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, 2003, pp. 427-440.

[22] A. Pultr, S.E. Rodabaugh, Categorical theoretic aspects of chain-valued frames: Part I: categorical and presheaf theoretic foundations, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 159 (2008) 501-528.

[23] A. Pultr, S.E. Rodabaugh, Categorical theoretic aspects of chain-valued frames: Part II: Applications to lattice-valued topology, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 159 (2008) 529-558.

[24] J. Qiao, A note on the specialization order of L-cotopological space, Fuzzy Systems and Mathematics 29(5) (2015) 37-43. (In Chinese)

[25] S.E. Rodabaugh, Point set lattice theoretic topology, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 40 (1991) 296-345.

[26] K.I. Rosenthal, Quantales and Their Applications, Longman, Essex, 1990.

[27] A.K. Srivastava, A.S. Khastgir, On fuzzy sobriety, Information Sciences 110 (1998) 195-205.

[28] K.R. Wagner, Liminf convergence in Ω-categories, Theoretical Computer Science 184 (1997) 61-104.

[29] W. Yao, An approach to fuzzy frames via fuzzy posets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 166 (2011) 75-89.

[30] W. Yao, A survey of fuzzifications of frames, the Papert-Papert-Isbell adjunction and sobriety, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 190 (2012) 63-81.

[31] D. Zhang, An enriched category approach to many valued topology, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 158 (2007) 349-366.

[32] D. Zhang, Y. Liu, L-fuzzy version of Stone's representation theorem for distributive lattices, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 76 (1995) 259-270.